

## Interview Summary

Application No.

09/853,841

Applicant(s)

RATCLIFF, RAYMOND F.

Examiner

Joseph P. Hirl

Art Unit

2121

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Joseph P. Hirl.

(3) Chin Wa.

(2) Dale S. Lazar.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 30 March 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kurowski, US Pub 2002/0019844.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See attached letter from applicant dated March 26, 2004. Applicant presented disclosure contrasted to prior art. Discussion focused on the generic nature of the disclosure and the need to adjust the claims to achieve novelty and non obviousness.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

### Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

### Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

#### Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

#### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

### Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Intellectual Property Group of  
Pillsbury Winthrop LLP  
Attorneys at Law  
P.O. Box 10500  
McLean, VA 22102

Telephone: (703) 905-2000

Our Facsimile #: (703) 905-2500

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSIONTO: UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICEFACSIMILE #: (703) 746.7290No. Pages (Including this page) 3 FAX Opr: M. LagiosIF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE CLEARLY ALL PAGES, PLEASE CONTACT US IMMEDIATELYBy Telephone AT: (703)905.2123 (local)  
or (703) 905-2000(local)

-&gt;-&gt;-&gt;

USPTO:

PLEASE ACKNOWLEDGE CLEAR RECEIPT OF ALL PAGES INDICATED  
ABOVE BY FAXING THIS PAGE BACK TO ONE OF OUR FACSIMILE  
NUMBERS STATED ABOVE

In re PATENT APPLICATION of

Inventor(s) Ratcliff

Appln. No. 09/853,841

series code ↑ ↑ serial no.

Filed: May 11, 2001Group Art Unit: 2121Examiner: Joseph HirlAtty. Dkt. PM 62000/281653

M#

Date: March 26, 2004

TITLE: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR  
PROVIDING A REWARD FOR THE  
USE OF A PROCESSOR IN A  
PARALLEL PROCESSING  
ENVIRONMENT

Name or type of signed paper being transmitted:  
Information Requested by the Examiner

MESSAGE:

(ATTN: Atty/Sec.: Transmit only one paper herewith. For papers not acceptable by fax, see back side or LAN  
Forms Directory PAT-286 Rear. Do not file originals but fasten them in our file (left side) with  
this sheet and fax receipt on top. Do NOT send the originals nor a confirmation copy to the PTO.)

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent  
and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Name Marilyn L. Lagios Sig. Marilyn L. Lagios Date March 26, 200462000/281653

C# / M#

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re PATENT APPLICATION of

Confirmation No: 6728

**Ratcliff**

Group Art Unit: 2121

Appln. No.: 09/853,841

Examiner: Joseph Hirl

Filed: May 11, 2001

Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR PROVIDING A REWARD FOR THE USE  
OF A PROCESSOR IN A PARALLEL PROCESSING ENVIROMENT

March 26, 2004

\* \* \* \* \*

**INFORMATION REQUESTED BY THE EXAMINER***By facsimile only to 703.746.7290*

Hon. Commissioner of Patents  
Alexandria, VA 22313

Dear Mr. Hirl:

We want to thank you for granting a personal interview on March 30, 2004.

Per your request made during the phone conversation on March 22, 2004, we prepared this letter to outline our assessment in distinguishing the claimed invention from the cited prior art reference. The principal prior art reference used in your 102 rejection is Kurowski (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0019844), which discloses a distributed computing system, which includes at least three necessary logical servers. In the Final Office Action, dated October 8, 2003, all claims have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102.

We filed a Response, dated March 8, 2004, to the Final Office Action. During the Response, we distinguished the claimed invention from Kurowski in terms of following aspects. First, Kurowski requires at least three types of servers necessary to perform parallel computing while the claimed invention does not require more than one kind of server. Second, Kurowski discloses a decentralized system while the

U.S. Application of RATCLIFF, USSN 09/853,841

claimed invention describes a centralized system. **Third**, in order for an idle computer to perform a task, the computer is required to communicate separately with three different types of servers. While a computer that is assigned a sub-task to perform only receives at least one algorithm with at least one portion of data from a server that assigns the sub-task to the computer. No additional communication is needed in order to start to carry out the sub-task. These points have also been elaborated in the Response. We hereby maintain our position that the claimed invention is not anticipated by Kurowski.

The personal interview is scheduled at 11:00 am, March 30, 2004. We look forward to meeting you and having the opportunity to discuss these issues with you. In the meantime, if you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call.

Respectfully submitted,  
Pillsbury Winthrop, LLP

By: 

Dale S. Lazar  
Reg. No.: 28872  
Tel. No.: (703) 905-2126  
Fax No.: (703) 905-2500

DSL\QCH:ml  
P.O. Box 10500  
McLean, VA 22102  
(703) 905-2000